

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 14-23 have been examined. New claims 24-33 have been added to further describe the patentable features of the present invention. Claims 7-13 were previously withdrawn as being related to a non-elected invention.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephonic interview of June 10, 2008, during which claims 1 and 14 were discussed in view of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 112 and 102. In particular, during the interview, the Examiner agreed that proposed amendments, similar to those set forth herein, would overcome the rejections but a new search would be required.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner assert that claim 14 may broadly be interpreted as using glasses to "optically read" whatever is being displayed, and an individual, person, or user to use the glasses and mentally "recognize" and "extract", and thus, does not fall within at least one of the four categories of patent eligible subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101 (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection in view of the self-explanatory amendments made herein.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6 and 14-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the reading component may be broadly interpreted as a pair of reading glasses. In addition, the Examiner notes that it is not clear what is

"being displayed". Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection in view of the self-explanatory amendments made herein.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by "Seeing and Visualizing: It's Not What You Think" by Zenon Pylyshyn, hereinafter Pylyshyn. However, Pylyshyn appears to relate merely to the eye "optically reading" any information before the eye and not to an electronic device which "optically reads" data displayed by electronic paper. That is, Pylyshyn does not appear relevant to the present invention. For example, Pylyshyn does not disclose "optically reading an electronic paper which is filled out by hand in a state in which a first image which has been recorded on the electronic paper in advance is being displayed...wherein the optical reading includes converting images optically read from the electronic paper into digital data." Therefore, claim 14 should be patentable for at least this reason.

IV. New claims

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 24-33 to further define the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit claims 24-33 recite additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

V. Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/764,506

Attorney Docket No.: Q79544

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 10, 2008